

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 14 and 18 have been amended. Claims 21-35 have been added. Claims 14 and 16-35 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsukamoto et al. (US 2002/0048033) (hereinafter "Tsukamoto").

Claims 14, 16 and 17

Amended claim 14 recites: "...determining whether the portable storage unit includes an execution file; executing an application program of the image processing apparatus; and executing the execution file stored in the portable storage unit as a plug-in program of the application program executed in the image processing apparatus, if the portable storage unit stores the execution file." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraphs [0031] and [0044] of the specification of the present application.

The Office Action relies on Tsukamoto to show these features of claim 14, and specifically relies on paragraphs [0030], [0115] – [0134] and [0141] – [0187] of Tsukamoto.

It is respectfully submitted that Tsukamoto does not teach or suggest executing an execution file stored in a portable storage unit as a plug-in program of an application program executed in the image processing apparatus, as recited in amended claim 14.

Referring to paragraph [0165] of Tsukamoto, the additional function card 1602 functions to reduce the load for the host CPU 101 and performs a function that is impossible for the host CPU 101. Accordingly, the Examiner's assertion that the program stored in the additional function card (1602) of Tsukamoto is analogous to a plug-in program is respectfully traversed. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Tsukamoto is it indicated that the program stored in the additional function card (1602) is executed by an image processing device as a plug-in program of an application program executed in the image processing device, as required by amended claim 14.

In Tsukamoto, the program stored in the storage enabled card is a program, for example a device driver for the modem card, to replace the function of the modem card set to the card slot, instead of executing a function of the image processing apparatus using a plug-in program.

Claims 16 and 17 depend on claim 14 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 18-20

Amended claim 18 recites: "...a detection unit detecting whether the portable storage unit is connected to the host unit, and determining whether the portable storage unit includes an execution file when detecting the portable storage unit is connected to the host unit; and a control unit executing the execution file stored in the portable storage unit as a plug-in program of an application program executed by the image processing apparatus, if the detection unit detects the execution file in the portable storage unit." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraphs [0031] and [0044] of the specification of the present application.

The Office Action relies on Tsukamoto to show these features of claim 18, and specifically relies on paragraphs [0030], [0115] – [0134] and [0141] – [0187] of Tsukamoto.

It is respectfully submitted that Tsukamoto does not teach or suggest executing an execution file stored in a portable storage unit as a plug-in program of an application program executed in the image processing apparatus, as recited in amended claim 18.

Referring to paragraph [0165] of Tsukamoto, the additional function card 1602 functions to reduce the load for the host CPU 101 and performs a function that is impossible for the host CPU 101. Accordingly, the Examiner's assertion that the program stored in the additional function card (1602) of Tsukamoto is analogous to a plug-in program is respectfully traversed. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Tsukamoto is it indicated that the program stored in the additional function card (1602) is executed by an image processing device as a plug-in program of an application program executed in the image processing device, as required by amended claim 18.

Claims 19 and 20 depend on claim 18 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 21-35 have been added to recite additional features of the present application. Further, new claims 21-35 are dependent on one of independent claims 14 and 18, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

No new matter has been added, and entry and consideration are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Jan 22, 2009

By:

Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501